

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 9, 2000

LB 155

the same statistics that we are. The average, I believe, of all of the multipliers used is about 2 percent.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay.

SENATOR STUHR: And some of them do not supply the social security, as we do here.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay. So, so, if we...let's just, to put this in perspective, if we go with a 2.0 multiplier, and we aren't integrated with social security, we let them have the full social security benefit plus the 2.0 multiplier, we are...we are...we are being on the generous side of those states with a 2.0 multiplier. Is that accurate?

SENATOR STUHR: It's probably accurate, but I know that with...we have had these discussions that this has been a goal that they have been trying to reach for probably the last ten years. And there has, you know, been some commitment that, you know, that's the goal that we wish to reach and that, you know, we won't be looking at an increase for...I'm not going to make any commitment (laugh) on that, but...

SENATOR BROMM: Right.

SENATOR STUHR: ...but that was just a goal that they...they have been trying to reach.

SENATOR BROMM: Another question. When we say that the benefit increase that we're giving here or proposing or approving, I should say, approving, when we say that's paid for, are we including future employees of the system, or are we talking about the current employees?

SENATOR STUHR: We...when we do the actuary studies we are only talking about the current employees. They look at the length of possible service that they will be providing and look at some other factors. But, no, it would be impossible to actually include future employees.

SENATOR BROMM: If...if by some chance, through a chain of events perhaps, involving the stock market and higher teachers